OMB C	control #	# 2060-	0482
-------	-----------	---------	------

Post Harvest

For EPA Use Only	/ ID #
SECTOR	

Worksheet 5. Application Summary 03-0027

out	for methyl bro	mide. There	fore, this works	neet cannot be cl	aimed as CBI.			
1. Consortium Name: 2. Location: 3. Crop: Pounds of Methyl 4. Bromide Requested		Name:	Pet Food Institute					
		U.S.						
		Pet Food						
		200	106,000	lbs.				
	Volume Treat							
	Methyl Brom		200		(1,000 cu ft)			
				ional years, reas				
-	No technicali	y or econon	ilically leasible	aiternatives exis	st for pest control within pet food manufacturing plants.			
-								
	2006_	106,000	_lbs.	Volume Treate				
	2007_	106,000	_lbs.	Volume Treate	d 78,000 (1,000 cu ft)			
Pla the	ce an "X" in th "Reasons" co	e column(s) l lumn to desc	abeled "Not Tec ribe why the pot	chnically Feasible ential alternative	" and/or "Not Economically Feasible" where appropriate. Use is not feasible.			
	Potential Alte	ernatives	Technically Feasible	Economically Feasible	Reasons			
Phospine alone and in combination		x	x	Phosphine is not a feasible alternative because of the risks posed to facilities and equipment due to corrosion. In facilities where production schedules are full, increased downtime would also increase the costs of phosphine use over methyl bromide significantly.				
Hea	at		х	х	Heat treatment is not feasible in every facility due to the need to empty facilities entirely of ingredients, products and packagaing materials. In addition, the increased costs from extended downtime are prohibitive.			
					,			
		······································						
		· ·····		·				
			:					

EPA Form # 7620-18b